



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,449	02/13/2004	Michael P. Dobrasko	1914A1	1510

7590 12/05/2007
Linda Pingitore
PPG Industries, Inc.
One PPG Place, 39W
Pittsburgh, PA 15272

EXAMINER

WEBB, GREGORY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,449

Applicant(s)

DOBRASKO ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory E. Webb

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 18-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5, 8-17 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other:

gww
12/10/7

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/24/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The scope of the applicant's composition claims and process claims are clearly different and would require different analysis by the examiner. It is well known that process claim limitations are treated differently not only in prosecution but also in which terms are afforded greatest weight. In a composition claim the material limitations are given a greater weight than the intended use. In contrast, in process claims the intended use, substrate, process limitations are given equal weight with those material limitations found in the composition. These differences are substantial enough that two separate classes have been created as stated in the previous restriction. As such the restriction is maintained.
3. Concerning the art arguments presented by applicant, the applicant's main argument centers about the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" as excluding compound affecting the material nature of the composition.
4. The applicant further argues that the prior art compositions are azeotropic and the instant claims are not directed to azeotropic composition.
5. Concerning the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of", the applicant has not provided evidence or support for the exclusion of any compound. The examiner has reviewed the specification for language specifically excluding compounds and did not find support for this argument. Applicant's arguments are not substitute for evidence.

6. Concerning the second argument, the applicant's claims broadly read do not exclude specific thermodynamic conditions. The phrase "composition consisting essentially of" in no way excludes compositions which are azeotropic. The claim does not contain a limitation restricting the use of any form of composition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook (US4961870).

Concerning the dichloroethylene, the alcohol, the alkylene oxide, the alkoxy phenol and the 4-methoxyphenol, Cook teaches the following comparative examples:

The stabilized azeotrope-like composition of Example 19 is 60 weight percent CFC-113; 37 weight percent **trans-1,2-dichloroethylene**; 3 weight percent **2-methyl-2-propanol**; 200 parts per million **1,2-butylene oxide**; and 200 parts per million **4-methoxyphenol**. The stabilized azeotrope-like composition of Example 20 is 60 weight percent CFC-113; 37 weight percent **trans-1,2-dichloroethylene**; 3 weight percent **3-pentanol**; 200 parts per million **1,2-butylene oxide**; and 200 parts per million **4-methoxyphenol**. (*emphasis added*)

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 5, 8-17, 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These specific combinations of dichloroethylene with the specific compounds recited in these claims were not found in the prior art of record.
10. Claims 18-20 are allowed. The specific combination of the dichloroethylene, butylene oxide, isopropyl alcohol and the specific free radical stabilizer were not found in the prior art of record.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory E. Webb whose telephone number is 571-272-1325. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-17:30 (m-f).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/780,449
Art Unit: 1796

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'G Webb', with the date '12/1/07' written below it.

Gregory E. Webb
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

gew